

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-7 have been cancelled, and Claims 16-23 have been added. Thus, Claims 8-23 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 8-15 have been amended.

The phrase "ability handle" on page 10, line 6 of the specification has been amended to "ability to handle." Thus, the objection to the specification is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Kalmanek, Jr. et al.* (US 6,694,429). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein..

Amended Claim 8 (and similarly Claim 16) now recites a step of "sending a reservation request for a virtual connection from said source workstation to a reservation server, wherein said reservation server includes connection setup means for setting up a virtual connection that meets a predefined Quality of Service (QoS) requirement from said ingress node to said egress node."

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed sending step is disclosed by *Kalmanek* in col. 6, lines 47-62. The Examiner seems to characterize *Kalmanek's* gate controllers 110 and/or 111 as the claimed reservation server. In col. 6, lines 59-62, *Kalmanek* explains that "upon receiving a setup request message from a calling party, the gate controller can authenticate the identity of the calling party and authorize the service sought by the calling party." However, the nature of the claimed reservation request for a virtual connection is different from the nature of *Kalmanek's* setup request message. In addition, *Kalmanek's* gate controllers do not include "connection setup means for setting up a virtual connection that meets a predefined Quality of Service (QoS) requirement from said ingress node to said egress node," as claimed.

The divergence between the claimed invention and the Examiner's characterization of *Kalmanek* grows farther apart in the claimed step of "determining whether or not said reservation

request can be validated based on user information within said source workstation, wherein said user information is accessible by said reservation server." The Examiner asserts that the claimed determining step is disclosed by *Kalmanek* in col. 9, lines 18-34. Since the claimed determining step is related to the determination of whether or not a reservation request can be validated based on user information within a source workstation, if col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* teaches the claimed determining step, col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* has to mention the claimed reservation request (or set up request message as characterized by the Examiner). However, *Kalmanek*'s set up request message was not mentioned in col. 9, lines 18-34 at all. Thus, it is clear that col. 9, lines 18-34 of *Kalmanek* does not teach or suggest the claimed determining step.

Because Claim 8 recites novel features that are not taught or suggested by *Kalmanek*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 8-23 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 8 and 16 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner, but not relied upon, has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Antony P. Ng  
Registration No. 43,427  
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS